

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 14 2006

Application No.: 09/965417

Case No.: 56233US002

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of these amendments and following comments. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 15, 19, and 21 have been amended to recite that the polarizer is provided as a polymeric reflective polarizer film roll. Support for this amendment is found, at least, at page 7, line 29 to page 8, line 20.

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 remain pending.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 457 607, in view of UK 2,326,727. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In order to establish a proper *prima facie* obviousness rejection, it is necessary, among other requirements, that the cited references disclose all the claimed elements. At a minimum, this requirement has not been met. Applicants do not concede that the Examiner has met the other requirements of a *prima facie* obviousness rejection.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest a reflective polarizer element. In addition, none of the cited references disclose providing the reflective polarizer element in roll form. Consequently, the *prima facie* obviousness rejection is flawed and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As described in the application, manufacturing a linear polarizer includes stretching or orientating the polarizer on a polymer web in either the machine or transverse direction. This results in a plane of polarization of the transmitted light being oriented either in the machine or the transverse direction. However, many LCDs have the transmission axes of the polarizer and analyzer at +/- 45 degrees with respect to the vertical display direction. Thus, the reflective polarizer film must be bias cut at a 45 degree angle with respect to the web to obtain a film with the proper orientation of the polarization axis for use with an LCD. This can result in a substantial loss of material due to the angular cut.

The claimed invention can provide a 45 degree polarization rotator that can be placed between the reflective polarizer and the LCD polarizer and also allows the reflective polarizer to be utilized in roll form. The advantages of preparing a single film, or an article, with a polymeric reflective polarizer and a polarization rotator can include a savings in space because of the

Application No.: 09/965417

Case No.: 56233US002

reduced thickness and a pre-aligned orientation between the polymeric reflective polarizer and the polarization rotator.

Claims 15-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over EP 457 607, in view of view of UK 2,326,727, and Sharp et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,999,240. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest, at least, a reflective polarizer element. Consequently, the *prima facie* obviousness rejection is flawed and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims. Prompt passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel a telephone interview would be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact their representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: July 14, 2006

Anna A. Kobilansky, Reg. No.: 53,146
Telephone No.: 651-737-8345

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: (612) 736-3833